

REMARKS

Claim 1 has been amended to clarify the subject matter regarded as the invention. Claims 1-4, 6, 7, 9-11, 13, and 14 are pending.

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-4, 6, 7, 9-11, 13, and 14 under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting. The Examiner objected to the terminal disclaimer filed 15 Apr 2005 as not proper because the attorney signing the terminal disclaimer was not of record. The enclosed terminal disclaimer is signed by applicants' undersigned representative, who is made of record herein by the revocation and power of attorney filed concurrently herewith. It is believed the enclosed terminal disclaimer overcomes the double patent rejection of claims 1-4, 6, 7, 9-11, 13, and 14.

The Examiner has rejected claim 1 under 35 USC 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claim 1 has been amended to recite "at a computer". Therefore, claim 1 is believed to overcome the rejection.

The Examiner has rejected claim 1 under 35 USC 103(a) as being updateable over Barber et al in view of Griswold, and Ross et al. With respect to claim 1, Barber teaches allowing licenses for a computer program to be available for use at each of a plurality of nodes of a network. Griswold describes a license management system that records the use of a licensed product and controls its use in accordance with the terms of the license. Ross teaches electronic management and enforcement of software licenses that can be used in a network or non-network environment to facilitate product licensing and upgrades. Barber, Griswold, and Ross do not teach a license string being generated using a cryptographic process by encoding data that includes "date" information corresponding to at least one of: a date of creation of the product; a date of a request for the product; and a date of generation of the license string; and verifying the license string including by: decoding the license string to identify the information; and determining that the "date" information is within a valid range, as recited in claim 1 as amended. Support for the amendment can be found without limitation, at lines 24-27 in page 27 of the specification. Thus, claim 1 is believed to be allowable.

Claims 2-4, 6-7, 9-11, and 13-14 depend from claim 1 and are believed to be allowable for the same reasons described above.

Reconsideration of the application and allowance of all claims are respectfully requested based on the preceding remarks. If at any time the Examiner believes that an interview would be helpful, please contact the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 9/28/05



William J. James
Registration No. 40,661
V 408-973-2577
F 408-973-2595

VAN PELT, YI & JAMES LLP
10050 N. Foothill Blvd., Suite 200
Cupertino, CA 95014